Buffer-Aided Relaying For The Two-Hop Full-Duplex Relay Channel With Self-Interference

Mohsen Mohammadkhani Razlighi and Nikola Zlatanov

Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

arXiv:1610.08693v1 [cs.IT] 27 Oct 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the two-hop full-duplex (FD) relay channel with self-interference and fading, which is comprised of a source, an FD relay, and a destination, where a direct source-destination link does not exist and the FD relay is impaired by self-interference. For this channel, we propose three buffer-aided relaying schemes with adaptive reception-transmission at the FD relay for the cases when the source and the relay both perform adaptive-power allocation, fixed-power allocation, and fixed-rate transmission, respectively. The proposed buffer-aided relaying schemes significantly improve the achievable rate and the throughput of the considered relay channel by enabling the FD relay to adaptively select to either receive, transmit, or simultaneously receive and transmit in a given time slot based on the qualities of the receiving, transmitting, and self-interference channels. Our numerical results show that significant performance gains are achieved using the proposed buffer-aided relaying schemes compared to conventional FD relaying, where the FD relay is forced to always simultaneously receive and transmit, and to buffer-aided half-duplex relaying, where the half-duplex relay cannot simultaneously receive and transmit.

I. Introduction

Relays play an important role in wireless communications for increasing the data rate between a source and a destination [1]. In general, the relay can operate in two different modes, namely, full-duplex (FD) mode and half-duplex (HD) mode. In the FD mode, transmission and reception at the FD relay can occur simultaneously and in the same frequency band. However, due to the simultaneous reception and transmission, FD relays are impaired by self-interference (SI), which occurs due to leakage of energy from the transmitter-end into the receiver-end of the FD relay. Currently, there are advanced hardware designs which can suppress the SI by about 120 dB in certain scenarios, see [2]. Because of this, FD relaying with SI is gaining research interest [2],

[3]. On the other hand, in the HD mode, transmission and reception takes place in the same frequency band but in different time slots, or in the same time slot but in different frequency bands. As a result, HD relays avoid the creation of SI. However, since an FD relay uses twice the resources compared to an HD relay, the achievable data rates of an FD relaying system may be significantly higher than that of an HD relaying system.

One of the first immediate applications of FD relaying is expected to be in providing support to HD base stations. In particular, the idea is to deploy FD relays around HD base stations, which will relay information from the HD base stations to users that are at significant distances from the base stations. The system model resulting from such a scenario is the two-hop FD relay channel, which is comprised of a source, an FD relay, and a destination, where a direct source-destination link does not exist due to the assumed large distance between the source and the destination. In this paper, we will investigate new achievable rates/throughputs for this system model, i.e, for the two-hop FD relay channel with SI and fading.

The two-hop relay channel with and without fading has been extensively investigated in the literature both for HD relaying as well as FD relaying with and without SI. In particular, the capacity of the two-hop HD relay channel without fading was derived in [4]. Thereby, it was shown that the capacity is achieved when the HD relay encodes additional information to the destination using the silences generated when the HD relay receives symbols from the source. On the other hand, only achievable rates are known for the two-hop HD relay channel with fading. In particular, [5] proposed a conventional decode-and-forward (DF) relaying scheme, where the HD relay switches between reception and transmission in a prefixed manner. On the other hand, [6] proposed a buffer-aided relaying scheme where, in each time slot, the HD relay selects to either receive or transmit based on the qualities of the receiving and transmitting channels. As a result, the rate achieved by the scheme in [6] is larger than the rate achieved by the scheme in [5]. On the other hand, the capacity of the two-hop FD relay channel with an idealized FD relay without SI was derived in [1] and [5] for the cases with and without fading, respectively. Recently, the capacity of the Gaussian two-hop FD relay channel with SI and without fading was derived in [7].

In this paper, we extend the buffer-aided relaying scheme proposed in [6] and [8] from HD relaying to FD relaying with SI. Thereby, we propose novel buffer-aided relaying schemes for the two-hop FD relay channel with SI and fading, which enable the FD relay to select adaptively

either to receive, transmit, or simultaneously receive and transmit in a given time slot based on the qualities of the receiving, transmitting, and SI channels such that the achievable data rate/throughput is maximized. In particular, we propose three buffer-aided relaying schemes with adaptive reception-transmission at the FD relay, for the cases when both the source and the relay perform adaptive-power allocation, fixed-power allocation, and fixed-rate transmission, respectively. The proposed buffer-aided schemes significantly improve the achievable rate/throughput of the considered relay channel. In particular, our numerical results show that significant performance gains are achieved using the proposed buffer-aided relaying schemes compared to conventional FD relaying, where the FD relay is forced to always simultaneously receive and transmit, and to buffer-aided HD relaying, where the HD relay cannot simultaneously receive and transmit.

We note that buffer-aided FD relaying schemes were also proposed in [9] and [10]. However, [9] assumes that the SI at the FD relay is negligeable, which may not be a realistic model for all scenarios in practice. On the other hand, [10] assumes that the SI channel is fixed and does not vary with time, which also may not be possible for all scenarios in practice. In particular, in practical wireless communications, due to the movement of objects/reflections, the SI channel also varies with time. As a result, in this paper, the SI channel is assumed to vary with time. In addition, the authors in [10] do not investigate the case when both the source and the relay transmit with a fixed rate in all time slots; a scenario which is investigated in this paper.

II. System and Channel Models

We consider the two-hop FD relay channel, which is comprised of a source, S, an FD relay, R, and a destination, D, where a direct S-D link does not exist and the FD relay is impaired by SI. In addition, we assume that the FD relay is a DF relay equipped with a sufficiently large buffer in which it can store incoming data and from which it can extract data for transmission to the destination.

A. Channel Model

We assume that the S-R and R-D links are complex-valued additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channels impaired by slow fading. Furthermore, similar to the majority of related papers [11], [12], we also assume that the SI channel is impaired by slow fading. Thereby, the

SI channel also varies with time. We assume that the transmission time is divided into $N \to \infty$ time slots. Furthermore, we assume that the fading is constant during one time slot and changes from one time slot to the next. Let $h_{SR}(i)$ and $h_{RD}(i)$ denote the complex-valued fading gains of the S-R and R-D channels in time slot i, respectively, and let $h_{RR}(i)$ denote the complex-valued fading gain of the SI channel in time slot i. Moreover, let $\sigma^2_{n_R}$ and $\sigma^2_{n_D}$ denote the variances of the AWGN at the relay and destination, respectively. For convenience, and without loss of generality, we define normalized squared fading gains for the S-R, R-D, and SI channels as $\gamma_{SR}(i) = |h_{SR}(i)|^2/\sigma^2_{n_R}$, $\gamma_{RD}(i) = |h_{RD}(i)|^2/\sigma^2_{n_D}$, and $\gamma_{RR}(i) = |h_{RR}(i)|^2/\sigma^2_{n_R}$, respectively. Let $P_S(i)$ and $P_R(i)$ denote the transmit powers of the source and the relay in time slot i, respectively. In time slot i, we assume that the source and the relay transmit codewords encoded with a capacity achieving code, i.e., codewords comprised of $n \to \infty$ symbols that are generated independently from complex-valued zero-mean Gaussian distributions with variances $P_S(i)$ and $P_R(i)$, respectively. The data rates of the codewords transmitted from the source and the relay in time slot i are denoted by $R_{SR}(i)$ and $R_{RD}(i)$, respectively. We assume that the SI, which is received via the SI channel in any symbol interval of time slot i, is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) according to the zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance $P_R(i)|h_{RR}(i)|^2$, similarly to the majority of related works [11]–[14]. This assumption can be realistic due to the various sources of imperfections in the SI cancellation process, and can also be considered as the worst-case scenario [15]. As a result, in time slot i, the S-R channel is a complex-valued AWGN channel with channel gain $h_{SR}(i)$ and noise variance $P_R(i)|h_{RR}(i)|^2+\sigma^2_{n_R}$. Hence, the capacity of this channel in time slot i is obtained as

$$C_{SR}(i) = \log_2\left(1 + \frac{P_S(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right). \tag{1}$$

On the other hand, in time slot i, the R-D channel is also a complex-valued AWGN channel with channel gain $h_{RD}(i)$ and noise variance $\sigma^2_{n_D}$. Hence, the capacity of this channel in time slot i is obtained as

$$C_{RD}(i) = \log_2\Big(1 + P_R(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\Big). \tag{2}$$

III. General FD Buffer-Aided Relying

In this section, we formulate the general FD buffer-aided relaying scheme with adaptive reception-transmission at the FD relay.

A. Problem Formulation

Depending on whether the source and/or the relay are silent, we have four different states for the considered two-hop FD relay channel with SI in each time slot. In particular, we have the following states:

- *State 0:* S and R are both silent.
- *State 1:* S transmits and R is silent.
- *State 2:* R transmits and S is silent.
- *State 3:* S and R both transmit.

To model these four states, we define three binary variables for time slot i, $q_1(i), q_2(i)$, and $q_3(i)$, as

$$q_1(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if S transmits and R is silent} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

$$q_2(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if R transmits and S is silent} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

$$q_3(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if S and R both transmit} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Now, since the two-hop FD relay channel can be in one and only one state in time slot i, the following has to hold

$$q_1(i) + q_2(i) + q_3(i) \in \{0, 1\}, \tag{6}$$

where if $q_1(i) + q_2(i) + q_3(i) = 0$ occurs, it means that the system is in State 0, i.e., both S and R are silent in time slot i.

To generalize the FD buffer-aided relaying scheme even further, we assume different transmit powers at the source and the relay during the different states. In particular, let $P_S^{(1)}(i)$ and $P_S^{(3)}(i)$ denote the powers of the source when $q_1(i) = 1$ and $q_3(i) = 1$, respectively, and let $P_R^{(2)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$ denote the powers of the relay when $q_2(i) = 1$ and $q_3(i) = 1$, respectively. Obviously, $P_S^{(1)}(i) = 0$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = 0$, and $P_S^{(3)}(i) = P_R^{(3)}(i) = 0$ when $q_1(i) = 0$, $q_2(i) = 0$, and $q_3(i) = 0$ hold, respectively.

In the following sections, we provide the optimal values for the state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$, which maximize the achievable rate and the throughput of the considered relay channel. To this end, we define the following auxiliary optimal state selection scheme

$$\text{Optimal Scheme} = \begin{cases} q_1(i)=1 & \text{if } \Lambda_1(i) > \Lambda_3(i) \\ & \text{and } \Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_2(i) \\ q_2(i)=1 & \text{if } \Lambda_2(i) > \Lambda_3(i) \\ & \text{and } \Lambda_2 > \Lambda_1(i) \\ q_3(i)=1 & \text{if } \Lambda_3(i) \geq \Lambda_1(i) \\ & \text{and } \Lambda_3 \geq \Lambda_2(i), \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

where $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ will be defined later on.

IV. Buffer-Aided Relaying with Adaptive-Rate Transmission

In this section, we provide buffer-aided relaying schemes for the cases when both the source and the relay adapt their transmission rates to the underlaying channels. Thereby, we provide two buffer-aided relaying schemes with adaptive-rate transmission; one in which both the source and the relay adapt their transmit powers to the underlying channels in each time slot, and the other one in which both the source and the relay transmit with fixed powers in each time slot.

A. Problem Formulation for Buffer-Aided Relaying with Adaptive-Rate Transmission

Using the state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$, and the transmit powers of the source and the relay for each possible state, we can write the capacities of the S-R and R-D channels in time slot i, $C_{SR}(i)$ and $C_{RD}(i)$, as

$$C_{SR}(i) = q_1(i)\log_2\left(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right) + q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right), \tag{8}$$

$$C_{RD}(i) = q_2(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) + q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right). \tag{9}$$

Now, since the source is assumed to be backlogged, we can set the transmission rate at the source in time slot i, $R_{SR}(i)$, to $R_{SR}(i) = C_{SR}(i)$, where $C_{SR}(i)$ is given by (8). As a result, the achievable rate on the S-R channel during $N \to \infty$ time slots, denoted by $\bar{R}_{SR}$, is obtained

as

$$\bar{R}_{SR} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_{SR}(i) \tag{10}$$
$$= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[q_1(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i) \right) + q_3(i) \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i) + 1} \right) \right].$$

On the other hand, the relay can transmit only if it has information stored in its buffer. Let $Q(i)$, denote the amount of (normalized) information in bits/symbol in the buffer of the relay at the end (beginning) of time slot i (time slot $i+1$). Then, we can set the transmission rate at the relay in time slot i, $R_{RD}(i)$, to $R_{RD}(i) = \min\{Q(i-1), C_{RD}(i)\}$, where $C_{RD}(i)$ is given in (9). As a result, the achievable rate on the R-D channel during $N \to \infty$ time slots, denoted by $\bar{R}_{RD}$, is obtained as

$$\bar{R}_{RD} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_{RD}(i) \tag{11}$$
$$= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\min \left\{ Q(i-1), q_2(i) \log_2(1 + P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)) + q_3(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i) \right) \right\} \right],$$

where $Q(i)$ is obtained recursively as

$$Q(i) = Q(i-1) + R_{SR}(i) - R_{RD}(i). \tag{12}$$

Our task in this section is to maximize the achievable rate of the considered relay channel given by (11). To this end, we use the following Lemma from [6, Theorem 1].

Lemma 1: The data rate extracted from the buffer of the relay and transmitted to the destination during $N \to \infty$ time slots, $\bar{R}_{RD}$, is maximized when the following condition holds

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[q_1(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i) \right) + q_3(i) \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i) + 1} \right) \right]$$
$$= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[q_2(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i) \right) + q_3(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i) \right) \right]. \tag{13}$$

Moreover, when condition (13) holds, the rate, $\bar{R}_{RD}$, given by (11), simplifies to

$$\bar{R}_{RD} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[q_2(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i) \right) + q_3(i) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i) \right) \right]. \tag{14}$$

Proof: See [6, Theorem 1] for the proof. ■

Lemma 1 is very convenient since it provides an expression for the maximum data rate, $\bar{R}_{RD}$, which is independent of the state of the buffer $Q(i)$. This is because, when condition (13) holds, the number of time slots for which $R_{RD}(i) = \min\{Q(i-1), C_{RD}(i)\} = Q(i-1)$ occurs is negligible compared to the number of time slots for which $R_{RD}(i) = \min\{Q(i-1), C_{RD}(i)\} = C_{RD}(i)$ occurs when $N \to \infty$, see [6]. In other words, when condition (13) holds, we can considered that the buffer at the relay has enough information almost always.

B. Buffer-Aided Relaying With Adaptive-Power Allocation

In this subsection, we assume that the source and the relay can adapt their transmit powers in each time slot such that a long-term average power constraint P is satisfied. More precisely, $P_S^{(1)}(i)$, $P_S^{(3)}(i)$, $P_R^{(2)}(i)$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$ have to satisfy the following constraint

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big[q_1(i)P_S^{(1)}(i)+q_2(i)P_S^{(3)}(i)\Big] + \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big[q_2(i)P_R^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)P_R^{(3)}(i)\Big] \leq P. \tag{15}$$

Now, employing Lemma 1, we devise the following optimization problem for maximizing the rate, $\bar{R}_{RD}$, when $N \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underset{q_k(i),P_S^{(k)}(i),P_R^{(k)}(i),\forall i,k}{\text{Maximize:}} \ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[q_2(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)\right]\\
&\text{Subject to :}\\
&\text{C1}: \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[q_1(i)\log_2\left(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right)+q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right)\right]\\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[q_2(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)\right]\\
&\text{C2}: q_k(i)\in\{0,1\}, \text{ for } k=1,2,3\\
&\text{C3}: q_1(i)+q_2(i)+q_3(i)\in\{0,1\}\\
&\text{C4}: \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big[q_1(i)P_S^{(1)}(i)+q_2(i)P_S^{(3)}(i)\Big]+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big[q_2(i)P_R^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)P_R^{(3)}(i)\Big]\leq P\\
&\text{C5}: P_S^{(k)}(i)\geq 0, P_R^{(k)}(i)\geq 0, \forall k,
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where constraint C1 ensures that (13) holds, C2 constrains the values that $q_k(i)$, $\forall k, i$, can assume, C3 ensures no more than one state is active at a given time slot i, C4 ensures the joint source-relay power constraint in (15) holds, and constraint C5 ensure that the transmit powers are non-negative.

In the following theorem, we provide the solution of problem (16), which maximizes the achievable rate of the considered buffer-aided FD relay channel with SI for adaptive-power allocation.

Theorem 1: The optimal state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k, i$, found as the solution of (16), are given in (7), where $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ are defined as

$$\Lambda_1(i) = \mu \log_2 \left(1 + P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right) - \zeta P_S^{(1)}(i), \tag{17}$$

$$\Lambda_2(i) = (1-\mu) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) - \zeta P_R^{(2)}(i), \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_3(i) = \mu \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right) - \zeta P_S^{(3)}(i) \\ + (1-\mu) \log_2 \left(1 + P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) - \zeta P_R^{(3)}(i).\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The optimal $P_S^{(1)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(2)}(i)$, found as the solution of (16), are given by

$$P_S^{(1)}(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{SR}(i)} & \text{if } \gamma_{SR}(i) > \lambda/\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

$$P_R^{(2)}(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{RD}(i)} & \text{if } \gamma_{RD}(i) > \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

where $\lambda \triangleq \frac{\zeta \ln(2)}{1-\mu}$ and $\rho \triangleq \frac{\mu}{1-\mu}$. Whereas, the optimal $P_S^{(3)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$ are obtained as the solution of the following system of two equations

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{-\mu\gamma_{RR}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)P_S^{(3)}(i)}{(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i))(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))} \\ &+ \frac{(1-\mu)\gamma_{RD}(i)}{(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i))} - \ln(2)\zeta = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$$\frac{\mu\gamma_{SR}(i)}{(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))} - \ln(2)\zeta = 0. \tag{23}$$

In (17)-(23), μ and ζ are constants found such that C1 and C4 in (16) are satisfied, respectively.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix A for the proof. ■

C. Buffer-Aided Relaying with Fixed-Power Allocation

In this subsection, we assume that the powers at the source and the relay cannot be adapted to the underlaying channels. As a result $P_S^{(1)}(i) = P_S^{(1)}$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = P_R^{(2)}$, $P_S^{(3)}(i) = P_S^{(3)}$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i) = P_R^{(3)}$ hold $\forall i$.

The maximum achievable rate for this case can be found from (16) by setting $P_S^{(1)}(i) = P_S^{(1)}$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = P_R^{(2)}$, $P_S^{(3)}(i) = P_S^{(3)}$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i) = P_R^{(3)}$, $\forall i$ in (16). As a result, we do not need to optimize in (16) with respect to these powers. Consequently, the constraints C4-C5 in (16) can be removed. Thereby, we get a new optimization problem for fixed-power allocation, whose solutions are provided in the following theorem.

Theorem 2: The state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k, i$, maximizing the achievable rate of the considered buffer-aided FD relay channel with SI for fixed-power allocation (i.e., found as the solution of (16) with $P_S^{(1)}(i) = P_S^{(1)}$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = P_R^{(2)}$, $P_S^{(3)}(i) = P_S^{(3)}$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i) = P_R^{(3)}$, $\forall i$, and constraints C4-C5 removed) are given in (7), where $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ are defined as

$$\Lambda_1(i) = \mu \log_2\left(1 + P_S^{(1)}\gamma_{SR}(i)\right), \tag{24}$$

$$\Lambda_2(i) = (1-\mu)\log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(2)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right), \tag{25}$$

$$\Lambda_3(i) = \mu \log_2\left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right) + (1-\mu)\log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right). \tag{26}$$

In (24)-(26), μ is a constant found such that constraint C1 in (16) holds.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix B for the proof. ■

Remark 1: We note that in the extreme cases when $\gamma_{RR}(i) \to \infty$ and $\gamma_{RR}(i) \to 0$ hold, i.e., when we have infinite and zero SI, the communication schemes provided in Theorems 1 and 2 converge to the corresponding schemes in [6] and [5], respectively.

D. Practical Estimation of the Necessary Parameters

The proposed state selection scheme, given in (7), requires the computation of $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ in each time slot. For the two proposed buffer-aided schemes, these parameters can be computed at the FD relay with minimum possible channel state-information (CSI) acquisition

overhead. Using $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$, the relay can compute the optimal state selection variables $q_1(i)$, $q_2(i)$, and $q_3(i)$ using (7), and feedback the optimal state to the source and the destination using two bits of feedback information. On the other hand, the computation of $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ at the relay requires full CSI of the S-R, R-D and SI channels at the relay, as well as acquisition of the constant μ. Since μ is actually a Lagrange multiplier, in the following, we describe a method for estimating this constant in real-time, using only current instantaneous CSI, by employing the gradient descent method [16].

In time slot i, we can recursively compute an estimate of the constant μ, denoted by $\mu_e(i)$, as

$$\mu_e(i) = \mu_e(i-1) + \delta(i)\left[\bar{R}^e_{RD}(i) - \bar{R}^e_{SR}(i)\right], \tag{27}$$

where $\bar{R}^e_{RD}(i)$ and $\bar{R}^e_{SR}(i)$ are real time estimates of $\bar{R}_{RD}$ and $\bar{R}_{SR}$, respectively, which can be calculated as

$$\bar{R}^e_{SR}(i) = \frac{i-1}{i}\bar{R}^e_{SR}(i-1) + \frac{1}{i}C_{SR}(i), \tag{28}$$

$$\bar{R}^e_{RD}(i) = \frac{i-1}{i}\bar{R}^e_{RD}(i-1) + \frac{1}{i}C_{RD}(i). \tag{29}$$

The values of $\bar{R}^e_{SR}(0)$ and $\bar{R}^e_{RD}(0)$ are initialized to zero. Moreover, $\delta(i)$ is an adaptive step size which controls the speed of convergence of $\mu_e(i)$ to μ, which can be some properly chosen monotonically decaying function of i with $\delta(1) < 1$.

For the buffer-aided relaying scheme with adaptive-power allocation, proposed in Theorem 1, in addition to μ, the constant ζ found in (17)-(19) has to be acquired as well. This can be conducted in a similar manner as the real-time estimation of μ. In particular, in time slot i, we can recursively compute an estimate of the constant ζ, denoted by $\zeta_e(i)$, as

$$\zeta_e(i) = \zeta_e(i-1) + \delta(i)\left[\bar{P}_e(i) - P\right], \tag{30}$$

where

$$\bar{P}_e(i) = \frac{i-1}{i}\bar{P}_e(i-1) + \frac{1}{i}\left[q_1(i)P_S^{(1)}(i) + q_2(i)P_R^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i)(P_R^{(3)}(i) + P_S^{(3)}(i))\right], \tag{31}$$

where $P_S^{(1)}(i)$, $P_S^{(3)}(i)$, $P_R^{(2)}(i)$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$ are given in Theorem 1.

V. Buffer-Aided Relaying with Fixed-Rate Transmission

In this section, we assume that the transmitting nodes, source and relay, do not have full CSI of their transmit links and/or have some other constraints that limit their ability to vary their transmission rates. As a result, the source and the relay transmit with a fixed-rate R_0 in each time slot. Moreover, we assume $P_S^{(1)}(i) = P_S^{(1)}$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = P_R^{(2)}$, $P_S^{(3)}(i) = P_S^{(3)}$, and $P_R^{(3)}(i) = P_R^{(3)}$, $\forall i$.

A. Derivation of the Proposed Buffer-Aided Relaying Scheme with Fixed-Rate Transmission

Due to the fixed-rate transmission, outages may occur, i.e., in some time slots the transmit rate might be larger than the underlying AWGN channel capacity thereby leading to an undecodable received codeword at the corresponding receiver. To model the outages on the S-R link, we define the following auxiliary binary variables

$$O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \log_2\left(1 + P_S^{(1)}\gamma_{SR}(i)\right) \geq R_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \log_2\left(1 + P_S^{(1)}\gamma_{SR}(i)\right) < R_0, \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

$$O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right) \geq R_0 \\ 0 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right) < R_0. \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

Similarly, to model the outages on the R-D link, we define the following auxiliary binary variables

$$O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(2)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) \geq R_0 \\ 0 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(2)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) < R_0, \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

$$O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) \geq R_0 \\ 0 \text{ if } \log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(3)}\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) < R_0. \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

Using $O_{SR}^{(1)}(i)$ and $O_{SR}^{(3)}(i)$, we can obtain that a codeword transmitted by the source in time slot i can be decoded correctly at the relay if and only if (iff) $q_1(i)O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) + q_3(i)O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) > 0$ holds. Similarly, using $O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)$ and $O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)$, we can obtain that a codeword transmitted by the relay in time slot i can be decoded correctly at the destination iff $q_2(i)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) > 0$

holds. Thereby, the throughputs on the S-R and R-D channels during $N \to \infty$ time slots, again denoted by $\bar{R}_{SR}$ and $\bar{R}_{RD}$, can be obtained as

$$\bar{R}_{SR} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0 \left[q_1(i) O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) \right] \tag{36}$$

$$\bar{R}_{RD} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \min \left\{ Q(i-1), R_0 \left[q_2(i) O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) \right] \right\}, \tag{37}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q(i) = Q(i-1) &+ R_0 \left[q_1(i) O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) \right] \\ &- \min \left\{ Q(i-1), R_0 \left[q_2(i) O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Our task in this section is to maximize the throughput of the considered relay channel with fixed-rate transmission given by (37). To this end, we use the following Lemma from [8, Theorem 1].

Lemma 2: The throughput $\bar{R}_{RD}$, given by (37), is maximized when the following condition holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0 \left[q_1(i) O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) \right] \\ &\quad = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0 \left[q_2(i) O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Moreover, when condition (39) holds, the throughput, $\bar{R}_{RD}$, given by (37), simplifies to

$$\bar{R}_{RD} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0 \left[q_2(i) O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i) O_{RD}^{(3)}(i) \right]. \tag{40}$$

Proof: See [8, Theorem 1] for the proof. ■

Using Lemma 2, we devise the following throughput maximization problem for the considered two-hop FD relay channel with SI and fixed-rate transmission

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underset{q_k(i),\forall i,k}{\text{Maximize:}}\ \tfrac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0\left[q_2(i)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)\right]\\
&\text{Subject to :}\\
&\quad \text{C1}: \tfrac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0\left[q_1(i)O_{SR}^{(1)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{SR}^{(3)}(i)\right]=\sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0\left[q_2(i)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)\right]\\
&\quad \text{C2}: q_k(i)\in\{0,1\},\ \text{for } k=1,2,3\\
&\quad \text{C3}: q_1(i)+q_2(i)+q_3(i)\in\{0,1\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

In (41), we maximize the throughput $\bar{R}_{RD}$, given by (40), with respect to the state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$, when conditions (6) and (39) hold, and when $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$, are binary. The solution of problem (41) leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 3: The state selection variables $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$, maximizing the throughput of the considered two-hop FD relay channel with SI and fixed-rate transmission, found as the solution of (41) are given in (7), where $\Lambda_1(i)$, $\Lambda_2(i)$, and $\Lambda_3(i)$ are defined as

$$\Lambda_1(i)=\mu O_{SR}^{(1)}(i), \tag{42}$$

$$\Lambda_2(i)=(1-\mu)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i), \tag{43}$$

$$\Lambda_3(i)=\mu O_{SR}^{(3)}(i)+(1-\mu)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i). \tag{44}$$

In (42)-(44), μ is a constant found such that constraint C1 in (41) holds.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix C for the proof. ■

B. Practical Estimation of the Necessary Parameters

For the buffer-aided relaying scheme with fixed-rate transmission, μ can be found theoretically by representing constraint C1 in (41) as

$$E\left\{q_1(i)O_{SR}^{(1)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{SR}^{(3)}(i)\right\}=E\left\{q_2(i)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)\right\} \tag{45}$$

and then using the probability distribution functions (PDFs) of the S-R, R-D, and SI channels to find μ for which this equality holds. Thereby, μ is obtained to be discrete as $\mu\in\{0,0.5,1\}$. As a result of the discreteness of μ, in (7), two state selection variables can both assume the value

one at a given time slot. In this case, similar to [8], a coin, which has adjusted probabilities, can be tossed to decide which of the two state selection variables should assume the value one. Due to limiting space, the derivation of the probabilities of the coin are not shown here. However, the fixed-rate scheme, proposed in Theorem 3, can still operate without any statistical knowledge in the following manner. We apply (27) to obtain an estimate of μ for time slot i, denoted by $\mu_e(i)$, where $C_{SR}(i)$ and $C_{RD}(i)$ in (28) and (29) are replaced by $q_1(i)O_{SR}^{(1)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{SR}^{(3)}(i)$ and $q_2(i)O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)$, respectively. We now let $\mu_e(i)$ to take any value in the range $[0,1]$. Then, when two state selection variables both assume the value one, according to (7), we select one at random with equal probability to assume the value one. For this scheme, we choose $\delta(i)$ to vary with i only during the first several time slots, and then we set it to a constant for the remaining time slots.

VI. Simulation and Numerical Results

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed buffer-aided schemes with adaptive reception-transmission at the FD relay for the two-hop FD relay channel with SI, and compare it to the performance of several benchmark schemes. To this end, we first define the system parameters, then introduce the benchmark schemes, and finally present the numerical results.

A. System Parameters

The mean of the channel gains of the S-R and R-D links can be calculated using the standard path loss model as

$$E\{|h_L(i)|^2\}=\left(\frac{c}{4\pi f_c}\right)^2 d_L^{-\alpha}\text{ , for } L\in\{\text{S-R},\text{R-D}\}, \tag{46}$$

where c is the speed of light, f_c is the carrier frequency, d_L is the distance between the transmitter and the receiver of link L, and α is the path loss exponent. In this section, we set $\alpha=3$, $f_c=2.4$ GHz, and $d_L=500$m for $L\in\{\text{S-R},\text{R-D}\}$. Moreover, we assume that the transmit bandwidth is 200 kHz, and the noise power per Hz is -170 dBm. Hence, the total noise power for 200 kHz is obtained as -117 dBm. On the other hand, the value of $E\{|h_{RR}(i)|^2\}$ is set to range between -100 dB to -140 dB. Note that $E\{|h_{RR}(i)|^2\}$ can be considered as the SI suppression factor of the corresponding SI suppression scheme.

B. Benchmark Schemes

In the following, we introduce three benchmark schemes which will be used for benchmarking the proposed buffer-aided relaying schemes. For the benchmark schemes, $P_S(i) = P_S$ and $P_R(i) = P_R$, $\forall i$, is assumed.

Benchmark Scheme 1 (Buffer-aided HD relaying with adaptive reception-transmission): The achievable rate of employing an HD relay and using the buffer-aided HD relaying scheme with adaptive reception-transmission proposed in [6], is given in [6, Section III-D].

Benchmark Scheme 2 (Conventional FD relaying with a buffer): In the conventional FD relaying scheme, the FD relay simultaneously transmits and receives during all time slots with $P_S = tP$ and $P_R = (1-t)P$. Because there is a buffer at the FD relay, the received information can be stored and transmitted in future time slots. As a result the achieved data rate during $N \to \infty$ time slots is given by

$$R_{FD,2} = \min \left\{ \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log_2\left(1 + \frac{tP\gamma_{SR}(i)}{(1-t)P\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right), \right.$$
$$\left. \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log_2\left(1 + (1-t)P\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) \right\}. \quad (47)$$

Benchmark Scheme 3 (FD relaying with an ideal FD relay without SI): This is identical to the Benchmark Scheme 2, except that $\gamma_{RR}(i)$ is set to zero, i.e, to $-\infty$ dB.

C. Numerical Results

All of the presented results in this section are generated for Rayleigh fading by numerical evaluation of the derived results and are confirmed by Monte Carlo simulations.

In Fig. 1, the rates achieved using the proposed FD buffer-aided scheme with adaptive-power allocation, fixed-power allocation, and fixed-rate transmission are compared with the benchmark schemes as a function of the average power, P. The average gain of the SI channel is set to $|h_{RR}(i)|^2 = -133$dB. For the fixed power allocation and fixed-rate transmission schemes we set $P_S^{(1)}(i) = P$, $P_R^{(2)}(i) = P$, $P_S^{(3)}(i) = tP$ and $P_R^{(3)}(i) = (1-t)P$, where $t = 0.5$, $\forall i$. Moreover, for the proposed buffer-aided scheme with fixed-rate transmission the value of R_0 is optimized numerically, for a given average power P, such that the throughput is maximized. As can be seen clearly from Fig. 1, the proposed schemes with and without power allocation achieve substantial



Fig. 1. Data rate vs. average consumed power of the proposed schemes and the benchmark schemes.

gains compared to the benchmark schemes. For example, the proposed adaptive-power allocation scheme has a power gain of about 2dB, 6dB and 9dB, compared to buffer-aided HD relaying for rates of 2, 5, and 7 bits per symbol, respectively. Moreover, as can be seen from Fig. 1, the performance of the conventional FD relaying scheme, i.e, Benchmark Scheme 2, is very poor. In fact, even the proposed fixed-rate transmission scheme outperforms the conventional FD scheme for $P > 35$ dBm.

In Fig. 2, we compare the achievable rates of the proposed buffer-aided scheme with fixed-power allocation, with the capacity of the ideal two-hop FD relay channel without SI and with the rate achieved by buffer-aided HD relaying as a function of the average transmit power at the source node, where $P_S^{(1)} = P_S^{(3)}$ is adopted, for different value of the SI. In this example, the power at the relay, $P_R^{(2)} = P_R^{(3)}$, is set to 25 dBm. Since the transmitted power at the relay node is fixed, the maximum possible data rate on the R-D channel is around 6.2 bits per symbol. As can be observed from Fig. 2, the data rate of the proposed buffer-aided scheme is considerably larger than the data rate of buffer-aided HD relaying when the transmit power at the source is larger than 25 dBm. For example, for 5 bits per symbol, the power gains are approximately 30


Data rate (in bits/symbol)
Source's Average Power (in dBm)
Proposed scheme with SI=−110dB
Proposed scheme with SI=−120dB
Proposed scheme with SI=−130dB
Proposed scheme with SI=−140dB
Ideal FD relaying without SI
HD buffer−aided relaying

Fig. 2. Data rate vs. the average consumed power at the source node of the proposed fixed-power scheme and the benchmark schemes when the average power at the relay is set to 25 dBm.

dB, 25 dB, 20 dB, and 15 dB compared to HD relaying for SI values of 140 dB, 130 dB, 120 dB, and 110 dB, respectively.

VII. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed three buffer-aided relaying schemes with adaptive reception-transmission at the FD relay for the two-hop FD relay channel with SI for the cases of adaptive-power allocation, fixed-power allocation, and fixed-rate transmission, respectively. The proposed schemes significantly improve the performance by optimally selecting the FD relay to either receive, transmit, or simultaneously receive and transmit in a given time slot based on the qualities of the receiving, transmitting, and SI channels. Our numerical results show that significant performance gains are achieved using the proposed buffer-aided relaying schemes compared to conventional FD relaying, where the FD relay is forced to always simultaneously receive and transmit, and to buffer-aided HD relaying, where the HD relay cannot simultaneously receive and transmit.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 1

We relax the constraints C2 and C3, and ignore C5, then use the Lagrangian. Thereby, with some simplification we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= q_2(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)\\ &-\mu[q_2(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)\\ &-q_1(i)\log_2\left(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right)-q_3(i)\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right)]\\ &-\zeta\left(q_1(i)P_S^{(1)}(i)+q_3(i)P_S^{(3)}(i)+q_2(i)P_R^{(2)}(i)+q_3(i)P_R^{(3)}(i)\right)\\ &-\lambda_1(i)q_1(i)-\lambda_2(i)(1-q_1(i))-\lambda_3(i)q_2(i)\\ &-\lambda_4(i)(1-q_2(i))-\lambda_5(i)q_3(i)-\lambda_6(i)(1-q_3(i))\\ &-\lambda_7(i)(q_1(i)+q_2(i)+q_3(i))-\lambda_8(i)(1-(q_1(i)+q_2(i)+q_3(i))),\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where μ, $\zeta \geq 0$ and $\lambda_k(i) \geq 0$, are the Lagrangian multipliers. By differentiating $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to $P_S^{(k)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(k)}(i)$, $\forall k$, then, setting the result to zero we obtain

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_S^{(1)}(i)} = \frac{\mu q_1(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))} - \zeta q_1(i) = 0, \tag{49}$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_R^{(2)}(i)} = \frac{(1-\mu) q_2(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i))} - \zeta q_2(i) = 0, \tag{50}$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_S^{(3)}(i)} = \frac{\mu q_3(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))} - \zeta q_3(i) = 0, \tag{51}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_R^{(3)}(i)} &= \frac{(1-\mu) q_3(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i))} - \zeta q_3(i)\\ &- \frac{\mu q_3(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)P_S^{(3)}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i))(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))} = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Now, we calculate the $P_S^{(k)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(k)}(i)$, $\forall k$, based on equation (49)-(52), and three different available states.

$q_1(i)=1$: We can set $q_2=0$ and $q_3=0$, so (49) become

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_S^{(1)}(i)}=\frac{\mu\gamma_{SR}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i))}-\zeta=0, \tag{53}$$

then by solving (53) we can obtain $P_S^{(1)}(i)$, as it is mentioned in (20).

$q_2(i)=1$: We can set $q_1=0$ and $q_3=0$, so (50) become

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dP_R^{(2)}(i)}=\frac{(1-\mu)\gamma_{RD}(i)}{ln(2)(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i))}-\zeta=0, \tag{54}$$

then by solving (54) we can obtain $P_R^{(2)}(i)$, as it is mentioned in (21).

$q_3(i)=1$: We can set $q_1=0$ and $q_2=0$, so (51) and (52) become (22) and (23), respectively. By solving them we can obtain $P_S^{(3)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$. Although there is a closed form solution for $P_S^{(3)}(i)$ and $P_R^{(3)}(i)$, since the solution is very long, we have decided not to show it in this paper.

Finally by referring from equation (48) and defining $-\lambda_7(i)+\lambda_8(i)\triangleq-\beta(i)$, we can find system selection scheme as following. Conditions which maximize (48), in cases that we have $q_1=1$, $q_2=0$ and $q_3=0$ are as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu log_2\left(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right)-\zeta P_S^{(1)}(i)-\beta(i)>0, \qquad (55)\\
&\text{And } (1-\mu)log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)-\zeta P_R^{(2)}(i)-\beta(i)<0,\\
&\text{And } (1-\mu)log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+\mu log_2\left(1+\tfrac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right)\\
&\quad -\zeta P_S^{(3)}(i)-\zeta P_R^{(3)}(i)-\beta(i)<0.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, for maximizing (48), in cases that we have $q_1=0$, $q_2=1$ and $q_3=0$, the following conditions must be held,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu log_2\left(1+P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right)-\zeta P_S^{(1)}(i)-\beta(i)<0, \qquad (56)\\
&\text{And } (1-\mu)log_2\left(1+P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)-\zeta P_R^{(2)}(i)-\beta(i)>0,\\
&\text{And } (1-\mu)log_2\left(1+P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right)+\mu log_2\left(1+\tfrac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right)\\
&\quad -\zeta P_S^{(3)}(i)-\zeta P_R^{(3)}(i)-\beta(i)<0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can say we will have $q_3 = 1$, and consequently, $q_1 = 0$ and $q_2 = 0$ if

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu log_2\left(1 + P_S^{(1)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)\right) - \zeta P_S^{(1)}(i) - \beta(i) < 0, \\ &\text{And } (1-\mu) log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(2)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) - \zeta P_R^{(2)}(i) - \beta(i) < 0, \\ &\text{And } (1-\mu) log_2\left(1 + P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RD}(i)\right) + \mu log_2\left(1 + \frac{P_S^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{SR}(i)}{P_R^{(3)}(i)\gamma_{RR}(i)+1}\right) \\ &\quad -\zeta P_S^{(3)}(i) - \zeta P_R^{(3)}(i) - \beta(i) > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

By substituting the corresponding terms in (55), (56) and (57) by (17), (18), and (19), we can derive system scheme. This completes the proof.

B. Proof of Theorem 2

It can be seen clearly from the problem definition, that the fixed-power problem is a special case of (16), when there is no power constraint. So, it just needed to remove constraint C4-C5 form (16) and corresponding solutions. As a result, we set $\zeta = 0$, and fix the allocated powers in each state. This completes the proof.

C. Proof of Theorem 3

We use the lagrangian. Thereby, with some simplification we can obtain

$$\mathcal{L} = q_1(i)\mu R_0 O_{SR}^{(1)}(i) + q_2(i)(1-\mu)R_0 O_{RD}^{(2)}(i) + q_3(i)\left[\mu R_0 O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) + (1-\mu)R_0 O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)\right]. \tag{58}$$

Now, we should find $q_k(i)$, $\forall k$ and μ for optimizing the problem. And we know that , $q_k(i) \in \{0,1\}$, $O_{SR}^{(k)}(i) \in \{0,1\}$ and $O_{RD}^{(k)}(i) \in \{0,1\}$, so for having distinguished none-negative term of, $\mu R_0 O_{SR}^{(1)}(i)$, $(1-\mu)R_0 O_{RD}^{(2)}(i)$ and $\left[\mu R_0 O_{SR}^{(3)}(i) + (1-\mu)R_0 O_{RD}^{(3)}(i)\right]$, we can neglect, R_0, and define, $\mu \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$. This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Cover and A. El Gamal, "Capacity Theorems for the Relay Channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 25, pp. 572–584, Sep. 1979.

[2] G. Liu, F. Yu, H. Ji, V. Leung, and X. Li, "In-Band Full-Duplex Relaying: A Survey, Research Issues and Challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 500–524, Secondquarter 2015.

[3] E. Ahmed and A. Eltawil, "All-Digital Self-Interference Cancellation Technique for Full-Duplex Systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 3519–3532, Jul. 2015.

[4] N. Zlatanov, V. Jamali, and R. Schober, "On the Capacity of the Two-Hop Half-Duplex Relay Channel," in *Proc. of the IEEE Global Telecomm. Conf. (Globecom)*, San Diego, Dec. 2015.

[5] A. Host-Madsen and J. Zhang, "Capacity Bounds and Power Allocation for Wireless Relay Channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 2020 –2040, Jun. 2005.

[6] N. Zlatanov, R. Schober, and P. Popovski, "Buffer-Aided Relaying with Adaptive Link Selection," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 1530–1542, Aug. 2013.

[7] N. Zlatanov, E. Sippel, V. Jamali, and R. Schober, "Capacity of the Gaussian Two-Hop Full-Duplex Relay Channel with Self-Interference," *Submitted in IEEE Trans. on Commun. Theory*, 2016. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.07394

[8] N. Zlatanov and R. Schober, "Buffer-Aided Relaying With Adaptive Link Selection – Fixed and Mixed Rate Transmission," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2816–2840, May 2013.

[9] N. Zlatanov, D. Hranilovic, and J. S. Evans, "Buffer-Aided Relaying Improves Throughput of Full-Duplex Relay Networks with Fixed-Rate Transmissions," *IEEE Commun. Letters*, vol. PP, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2016.

[10] K. T. Phan and T. Le-Ngoc, "Power Allocation for Buffer-Aided Full-Duplex Relaying With Imperfect Self-Interference Cancelation and Statistical Delay Constraint," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 3961–3974, 2016.

[11] T. Riihonen, S. Werner, and R. Wichman, "Mitigation of Loopback Self-Interference in Full-Duplex MIMO Relays," *IEEE Trans. Signal Proces.*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 5983–5993, Dec. 2011.

[12] B. Day, A. Margetts, D. Bliss, and P. Schniter, "Full-Duplex MIMO Relaying: Achievable Rates Under Limited Dynamic Range," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1541–1553, Sep. 2012.

[13] M. Duarte, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, "Experiment-Driven Characterization of Full-Duplex Wireless Systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 4296–4307, Dec. 2012.

[14] D. Bharadia, E. McMilin, and S. Katti, "Full Duplex Radios," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 375–386, Aug. 2013.

[15] I. Shomorony and A. S. Avestimehr, "Is Gaussian Noise the Worst-case Additive Noise in Wireless Networks?" in *IEEE Intern. Sym. on Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, July 2012, pp. 214–218.

[16] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.